

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action mailed July 18, 2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 23, 42 and 44 have been amended to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention and/o to correct dependency matters. New claim 48 also particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. Support for the amendments and new claim may be found specification and original claims.

Claims 43, 45, and 46 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

In view of the Examiner's earlier restriction requirement, Applicant retains the right to present claims 6-22, 29-41, and 47 in a divisional Application.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 23-28 and 42-46 stand objected to because "the claims were dependent on non-elected claims withdrawn from consideration". Independent Claims 23 and 42 have been amended to depend from Claim 1. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### **The 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection**

Claims 1-5, 23-28 and 42-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jordan et al. (US Publication 2004/0053681 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

According to the M.P.E.P. § 2131, a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b) and (e) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

The Office Action states that Jordon discloses:

“a server computer on a server network comprising a single-write data storage (disk), with an operational event controller ,with all the parts of a computer, such as processor, memory, magnetic disk, CD, disk drive, where in a network of computers communicate operational event data upon requests (Fig 4 and claim 1).”

Applicants respectfully disagree, for the reasons, among others, discussed below.

Claim 1 provides for the following features:

“a network computer operatively coupled to said server computer, said network computer comprising a single-write data storage device and an operational event controller operatively coupled to said single-write data storage device, said operational event controller comprising a processor and a memory operatively coupled to said processor,

said operational event controller being programmed to retrieve operational event data,

said operational event controller being programmed to permanently store said operational event data on said data storage device.”

The claimed invention provides for a network computer coupled to a server computer. The network computer comprises a single-write data storage device and an operational event controller to retrieve operational event data. As provided in the Specification, “the single-write data storage device which may be an optical disk drive with a writable optical disk, a magnetic disk drive with a magnetic disk, a solid-state memory device, a hard drive, or any other device which may be written with data once, but not alterable or erasable once the data is written (i.e., write-once, read-only).” (Specification, paragraph [0056]).

Jordon teaches a “printer on a networked gaming device can be controlled by the network to generate awards.” (Abstract) Jordon is simply concerned with “promoting player loyalty to a gaming system by generating and redeeming promotional tickets” (Abstract) and not with a “gaming unit being able to write operational event data to a single-write data storage device” (Specification, paragraph [0001]) as provided in the claimed invention.

The Office Action cites Fig. 4 and Claim 1 of Jordan as teaching the elements of the claimed invention. However, upon a closer reading of Jordan, Jordan does not teach the use of “a network computer operatively coupled to said server computer ... said network computer comprising a single-write data storage device and an operational event controller operatively coupled to said single-write data storage device” as claimed in Claim 1. In fact, Jordan does not teach the use of or mention a network computer, much less a network computer having single-write data storage device.

Should the Examiner maintain this rejection, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically point out where all the elements of the claim are disclosed in Jordan. “When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified.” 37 C.F.R. 1.104. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner clearly set forth where in Fig. 4 and/or claim 1 of Jordan that teaches the elements of Claim 1.

Accordingly, since Jordan does not teach each and every element of the claimed invention, it can not be said to anticipate the claimed invention. As to dependent claims 2-5, 23-28 and 42-46, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Jordan alone. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 4 depends from Claim 1. Thus, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

#### Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited and Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. IGT1P545).

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Adrienne Yeung/  
Adrienne Yeung  
Registration No. 44,000

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(408) 255-8001